

My colleagues, this is a situation that must not be tolerated. The frequency of these attacks and the lack of prosecution of extremists who perpetrate these crimes are in direct opposition to the most basic tenets of our democracy and surely the democracy in India. I urge the Indian Government to protect religious minorities and to take strong steps to enforce their constitutional laws regarding religious freedom in these oppressive provinces.

THE RISING PRICE OF GAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. As I speak on the floor today, across America citizens are being gouged at the gas pump once again. Every year, as certain as Memorial Day is celebrated at the end of this month, the oil industry jacks up prices.

On the west coast in Oregon, I paid \$3.43 a gallon for regular in Springfield. My colleague, GREG WALDEN, paid \$3.99 on the east side of the mountains. The local paper accounts for this by saying "unexpected refinery maintenance." Hmm. Maybe they could schedule maintenance at a different time of year. No, that wouldn't be quite so profitable for the industry. In fact, the industry has been colluding for more than a decade to close down refinery capacity so they can have these wonderful price spikes and gouge American consumers.

There was an industry memo back then saying how the refinery sector wasn't particularly profitable, but through mergers the industry has managed to do away with more than 100 refineries. Now we have a refinery shortage. And if they just close one down to sweep the floors, the price of gas goes up 20 cents a gallon and the industry execs cry all the way to the bank and to their bonuses. This has to stop. We have to get back in charge of this industry. We've got to break up these huge conglomerates. Start with a moratorium on further mergers. Break 'em up. Impose a windfall profits tax. Unless they invest in more refinery capacity, unless they invest in new fuels or energy efficiency, confiscate the money from them through a windfall profits tax which they have taken from the American consumers through price-gouging and reinvest it to bring down prices and make this country more energy-efficient in the future. We need both a short-term and a long-term strategy to deal with this industry.

We have to take on the OPEC cartel. Now, this President is all about free trade. All about free trade. He wants more free trade agreements. Seven of the members of OPEC are in the World Trade Organization, highly touted by this President as a rules-based trade organization to promote free trade. They are conspiring and colluding among themselves and with Big Oil to

jack up the price of oil. That's illegal under the WTO. Why won't President Bush file a complaint against OPEC? Perhaps because he's a little too tight with the Saudis, the royal family that runs that country and others. And they obviously, as well as industry execs, are profiting immensely from this situation.

We need to, as I said earlier, ban further mergers. My bill would establish a commission to study market power and suggest remedies to that. To me the simplest remedy is antitrust and to break up some of these giant conglomerates and again begin to bring a little bit of competition back to this industry.

The windfall profits tax I mentioned earlier, impose a windfall profits tax on these folks and take that money and reinvest it in energy efficiency and new fuels and research unless they will spend the money on energy efficiency, new fuels, and refinery capacity which is needed in this country.

If we don't take action, it isn't going to happen. ExxonMobil is making \$4.6 million per hour, \$109 million per day, \$3.2 billion a month and \$40 billion last year. One corporation. Last quarter they set yet another record. And you can bet with the price-gouging going on today, they're going to set yet another record. Every quarter is a new record. But the President talks about free market forces. These aren't free market forces. These people are conspiring to gouge the American consumers and drive up prices at the pump. We need real price relief soon. This Congress must act and the President must stop stonewalling and protecting his friends both domestically and internationally who are involved in the oil cartel.

CHINA AND THE 2008 OLYMPICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentlelady.

I want Members to see an editorial that was in the Wall Street Journal by Ronan Farrow and Mia Farrow entitled "The Genocide Olympics."

It deals with the issue that there was a full page ad today in The Washington Post with regard to the genocide that is taking place in Sudan, and the one country that has the opportunity to really make a difference to stop the genocide in Sudan is the country of China.

Mia Farrow says in this editorial, "One World, One Dream is China's slogan for the 2008 Olympics. But there is one nightmare that China shouldn't be allowed to sweep under the rug. That nightmare is Darfur, where more than 400,000 people have been killed and more than 2½ million driven from flaming villages by the Chinese-backed government of Sudan."

I have seen those villages and the burning of the villages and we know

that the genocide could be stopped by China.

Mia Farrow goes on to say, "That so many corporate sponsors want the world to look away from that atrocity during the games is bad enough. But equally disappointing is the decision of artists like director Steven Spielberg, who quietly visited China this month as he prepares to help stage the Olympic ceremonies, to sanitize Beijing's image." Steven Spielberg, who produced Schindler's List, is now going to try to turn the 2008 Olympics in China to look like a wonderful, wonderful thing.

China is involved in Sudan where they have Antonov bombers bombing the people, helicopters coming in and killing the people, and the Janjaweed who come in and do all sorts of bad things—kill, rape and maim. And China has used its veto power, Mia Farrow says, on the U.N. Security Council to repeatedly obstruct efforts by the U.S. and the U.K. to introduce peacekeepers to curtail the slaughter. Beijing, she says, is uniquely positioned to put a stop to the slaughter, yet they have so far been unabashed in their refusal to do so.

Now, there are some people saying that maybe—maybe—the 2008 Olympics ought to be boycotted. Now, how will you feel, watching or going to the 2008 Olympics and knowing that the country that is doing that could stop the genocide in Darfur?

And so I would urge that if China does not deal with the issue, then the sponsors, but also the people from the West, certainly ought not encourage China to say that we don't care, therefore, we're going to go to your Olympics when Mia Farrow calls it "the Genocide Olympics."

And then she says some other very tough things about Spielberg. Does he really want to be this? I mean, the Chinese are in essence doing what the Nazis did in the Olympics in the thirties, cleaning the streets and changing things.

China has the ability to stop the genocide that is taking place in Sudan, and I think everyone should do everything they can. This administration should do more and everyone in the Congress should do more, that if China doesn't use its leverage in the U.N. and allow the Security Council to pass a resolution allowing the end to come out with regard to U.N. peacekeepers in Darfur, then I believe that Mia Farrow and those who are concerned and are considering boycotting the Olympics will be right. This is a test for China.

Now, the Chinese Embassy is working this Hill aggressively. The Chinese Embassy will be working the administration. The Chinese Embassy will be working powerful governments around the world. But as long as the genocide continues in Darfur where 400,000 people have died, 2.1 million are living in refugee camps, knowing that China has the ability to stop what it mentions on

page A-18 in the Washington Post today in this editorial to stop this, then if China is not prepared to use their leverage to stop the genocide, then quite frankly I think Mia Farrow's title of calling this "the Genocide Olympics" will be true and no one should attend those Olympics.

THE "GENOCIDE OLYMPICS"

(By Ronan Farrow and Mia Farrow)

"One World, One Dream" is China's slogan for its 2008 Olympics. But there is one nightmare that China shouldn't be allowed to sweep under the rug. That nightmare is Darfur, where more than 400,000 people have been killed and more than two-and-a-half million driven from flaming villages by the Chinese-backed government of Sudan.

That so many corporate sponsors want the world to look away from that atrocity during the games is bad enough. But equally disappointing is the decision of artists like director Steven Spielberg—who quietly visited China this month as he prepares to help stage the Olympic ceremonies—to sanitize Beijing's image. Is Mr. Spielberg, who in 1994 founded the Shoah Foundation to record the testimony of survivors of the holocaust, aware that China is bankrolling Darfur's genocide?

China is pouring billions of dollars into Sudan. Beijing purchases an overwhelming majority of Sudan's annual oil exports and state-owned China National Petroleum Corp.—an official partner of the upcoming Olympic Games—owns the largest shares in each of Sudan's two major oil consortia. The Sudanese government uses as much as 80% of proceeds from those sales to fund its brutal Janjaweed proxy militia and purchase their instruments of destruction: bombers, assault helicopters, armored vehicles and small arms, most of them of Chinese manufacture. Airstrips constructed and operated by the Chinese have been used to launch bombing campaigns on villages. And China has used its veto power on the U.N. Security Council to repeatedly obstruct efforts by the U.S. and the U.K. to introduce peacekeepers to curtail the slaughter.

As one of the few players whose support is indispensable to Sudan, China has the power to, at the very least, insist that Khartoum accept a robust international peacekeeping force to protect defenseless civilians in Darfur. Beijing is uniquely positioned to put a stop to the slaughter, yet they have so far been unabashed in their refusal to do so.

But there is now one thing that China may hold more dear than their unfettered access to Sudanese oil: their successful staging of the 2008 Summer Olympics. That desire may provide a lone point of leverage with a country that has otherwise been impervious to all criticism.

Whether that opportunity goes unexploited lies in the hands of the high-profile supporters of these Olympic Games. Corporate sponsors like Johnson & Johnson, Coca-Cola, General Electric and McDonalds, and key collaborators like Mr. Spielberg, should be put on notice. For there is another slogan afoot, one that is fast becoming viral amongst advocacy groups; rather than "One World, One Dream," people are beginning to speak of the coming "Genocide Olympics."

Does Mr. Spielberg really want to go down in history as the Leni Riefenstahl of the Beijing Games? Do the various television sponsors around the world want to share in that shame? Because they will. Unless, of course, all of them add their singularly well-positioned voices to the growing calls for Chinese action to end the slaughter in Darfur.

Imagine if such calls were to succeed in pushing the Chinese government to use its

leverage over Sudan to protect civilians in Darfur. The 2008 Beijing Olympics really could become an occasion for pride and celebration, a truly international honoring of the authentic spirit of "one world" and "one dream."

RESPONSIBILITY TO IRAQI REFUGEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am privileged to take the floor after my colleague from Virginia and I am in agreement with the sentiment that he has expressed. However, I would like to speak for a moment about the second greatest refugee crisis in the world after Darfur.

Four years after the fall of Baghdad, many of the worst fears expressed at the beginning of that war have come true, as Iraq and its neighbors are in the midst of a humanitarian crisis rivaled only by the ongoing genocide in Darfur, referenced by my good friend from Virginia. Iraq has the fastest growing refugee population in the world. The United States has a responsibility to try to protect the innocent victims of massive violence wherever it can. However, having made the decision to begin a war of choice in Iraq, we have a particular responsibility to those who are suffering as a result of America's actions. Whatever one believes about the wisdom of the war or the future of the United States' engagement in Iraq, we have a responsibility to those innocent Iraqis who have been driven from their homes or fear for their lives every day.

The numbers are sobering. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees estimates 4 million Iraqis have been made refugees, 2 million of which have left for adjacent countries like Syria and Jordan. Every month, another 50,000 to 70,000 Iraqis continue to be displaced from their homes, and these figures likely underestimate the magnitude of the problem. These are the front lines of a regional humanitarian crisis, one that could easily destabilize these front line countries that neighbor Iraq and turn a humanitarian crisis into a security disaster.

For one group in particular, however, our moral responsibility is unquestionable—Iraqis who are at risk because they helped the United States. Having collaborated with the United States military, the United Nations or even with a nongovernmental organization can literally mean a death sentence at the hands of any of the many sides in this civil war. Tens of thousands of Iraqis, who worked as translators, drivers, even construction workers, live every day in fear of being targeted. However, the United States is only allowing 50 Iraqi translators to start their lives over in the United States.

Over the next few months, that may be raised to 500, a number that is still dwarfed by the need.

I became acutely aware of this problem working with a local high school in Portland who were partnering with members of the Oregon National Guard who had served in Iraq who were trying to bring their translator to the United States to save her life but kept running into bureaucratic hurdles. Since then, I've heard the same story over and over again.

We should keep faith with those who have served alongside our brave men and women in uniform. This is a basic moral responsibility and a simple issue of fairness. Yet in March, the United States admitted only 11 Iraqi refugees. Since the war began, we have admitted only 700—remember, out of 4 million displaced.

I am introducing legislation this week, the Responsibility to Iraqi Refugees Act, to address this ongoing humanitarian crisis to use all of the tools at our disposal, admitting refugees, providing assistance to the region, and using diplomacy to ensure their well-being. It creates a program to admit to the United States Iraqis who are at risk because they helped coalition or reconstruction efforts. It establishes a special coordinator for Iraqi refugees and internally displaced people and requires the United States to develop plans to ensure the well-being and safety of these Iraqi refugees. Most important, it increases the number of persecuted Iraqis who can be admitted to the United States as refugees. And, finally, it would authorize additional funding for assistance to those refugees, their resettlement and fixing the bureaucratic process that often hampers even the most well-intended efforts.

I urge every Member of the House to cosponsor this broad, ambitious and comprehensive response to the Iraqi refugee crisis before it is too late, too late for the people whose only crime was working with Americans.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord, Your heavens are filled with the wide and brilliant blue, a common